

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

**2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT**

**FOR:**

**Midwest Life Enhancement**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Satisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 3-2:1	Satisfactory		

**ACTION NEEDED:    NONE**

*(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Midwest Life Enhancement's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).*

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Midwest Life Enhancement

**SITE:** 2143 Boulevard Place

**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** Ms. M. & E.B.

**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 2

**DATE:** 2-9-07

**REVIEWER:** ST, MC

**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 4:55pm

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	S		<p>Students worked in two groups with a tutor. In one group, the tutor reviewed various types of writing styles with students using overhead transparencies and poster board demonstrations. Students were then asked to review the elements of a story. Students volunteered answers based on information they recalled from previous lessons. Then as a group, the students were asked to complete a worksheet on the overhead on revising fragments into complete sentences.</p> <p>The second group of two students worked independently on language arts and math exercises with a tutor. The tutor worked back and forth between the students. The tutor reviewed the directions for each child's assignment, practiced an example with the student, and then let each student work independently until the student was finished. When a student completed their assignment, the tutor reviewed the assignment and worked with each student on problem areas. These students were encouraged to use manipulatives such as poster boards, flash cards, coins, and other hands-on items to assist them with their lessons on compound words, creating and discovering contractions, and addition with monetary units.</p> <p>Observed lessons match original description in provider application. The use of manipulatives, cooperative learning, and project-based learning as described in the application were all apparent during observed lesson. However, it was not evident how each student's Personalized Education Plan (as described in the application) plays a role in shaping lessons or instruction.</p>
Instruction is clear	S		For the most part, tutors provided clear directions that students were able to understand. Tutors provided appropriate direct support to students who needed more detailed explanations and guidance. Tutors were able to address questions posed by their students.
Time on task is appropriate	S		Students were generally engaged in their lessons, however, there were times (with the group working on writing styles) when discussion ventured off topic.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	S		Tutors provided encouragement and positive feedback when appropriate. Tutors coached students without simply giving them the answers when the students were challenged by a concept. Tutors asked students questions to determine how effectively the students were able to apply the concepts being explained.
Student/instructor ratio: <u>3-2:1</u>	S		Application notes that the ratio will be 5:1 and that instruction will be individual or in small groups. A 3-2:1 ratio and small group instruction were observed.

